

PATH/ IMPLEMENTATION TEAM MEETING NOTES

March 3, 1999, 9:00 a.m.-noon

**NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE OFFICES
PORTLAND, OREGON**

DRAFT

Greetings, Introductions and Review of the Agenda.

The March 3, 1999 meeting of PATH and the Implementation Team, held at the National Marine Fisheries Service's offices in Portland, Oregon, was chaired by Brian Brown of NMFS and PATH facilitator David Marmorek, and was facilitated by Donna Silverberg.

The following is a distillation (not a verbatim transcript) of items discussed at the meeting, together with actions taken on those items. Please note that some enclosures referenced in the body of the text may be too lengthy to attach; all enclosures referenced are available upon request from NMFS's Kathy Ceballos at 503/230-5420 or via email at kathy.ceballos@noaa.gov.

Brown and Silverberg welcomed everyone to the meeting, led a round of introductions and a review of the agenda.

I. Progress on Fall Chinook and Mid-Columbia Tasks.

Marmorek reminded the other meeting participants that, at the December IT meeting, it was agreed that the fall chinook analysis would be PATH's highest priority. Since then, he said, PATH has made considerable progress in both life-cycle modeling and passage modeling; a meeting on the fall chinook life-cycle modeling is scheduled for March 11. A passage modeling meeting is set for the following week; at that meeting, we hope to have finalized the assumptions, Marmorek said.

Marmorek touched briefly on last Thursday's PATH public forum, held at the Power Planning Council offices in Portland; he called this meeting a success. He added that PATH has had a little discussion lately of whether or not any further peer reviews for PATH are desirable or necessary. There is a difference of opinion within PATH on this issue, and although it's possible that it will eventually need to be brought to the IT, the PATH participants need to discuss it further among themselves, Marmorek said.

PATH is planning an internal workshop at the end of April to review the fall chinook analyses and see what further work needs to be done to complete them, Marmorek continued. You might think of this workshop as "take two" of the decision analysis for fall chinook, he said. During the May/June period, PATH plans to complete a mid-year update to its FY'98 final report, focused mainly on the fall chinook analysis. How much of this other work will get done depends on how the fall chinook work goes, and how long it takes PATH to review the A-Fish appendix, Marmorek said.

Marmorek drew a pie chart, showing the work items currently on PATH's plate. These items include:

- fall chinook analysis
- review of the A-Fish appendix
- additional work on spring/summer chinook
- experimental management
- scoping the analyses needed on the Mid-Columbia stocks
- public presentations
- steelhead analysis
- other: additional peer review, John Day drawdown recon-level analysis, existing actions minus 427 KAF flow augmentation, fall chinook sensitivity analyses, Biological Assessment of river operations.

II. John Day Drawdown Analysis.

Doug Arndt said the Corps needs to produce its Phase 1 report on John Day drawdown by September, so that it can go out for regional review prior to its delivery to Congress in December. Phase 1 is a recon-level report, intended to give Congress enough information to determine whether or not the Phase 2 (feasibility-level) report on John Day drawdown should proceed. There are three pieces to the Phase 1 report – an engineering/technical analysis, an economic analysis and a biological analysis. Arndt said it is the Corps' intention that the biological portion of this analysis will look at the three conditions currently under discussion – the existing base condition, a spillway crest condition and a natural river condition.

The biological analysis needs to take a preliminary look at the key species that would be affected by these three conditions, Arndt said; as I said, it needs to include enough information so that Congress can decide whether or not to proceed to a feasibility-level analysis. It currently looks as though this biological analysis needs to be completed by the end of July; the key species considered would be spring/summer and fall chinook, steelhead and sockeye, including the Mid-Columbia stocks. Is that something PATH feels would be doable? Arndt asked.

First, I think you would have to separate out the stocks, Marmorek replied. Doing just John Day drawdown to natural river for Snake River spring/summer and fall chinook is not that big a stretch beyond what PATH has already done under Alternative B1. It would not be that big a task, he said, but the question is, how important is that task relative to things like experimental management and further work on spring/summer chinook?

Moving on to the Mid-Columbia stocks, Marmorek said, at least at first blush, I don't think it would be feasible for PATH to complete an analysis of the effects of John Day drawdown on those stocks by the end of July. After a few minutes of additional discussion, however, Howard Schaller said it may be possible for PATH to produce some level of analysis on the Mid-Columbia stocks and steelhead, at least in a comparative sense, which may satisfy Congress' information needs in a scoping-level study, by late July. Again, however, it depends on how the IT would prioritize that work relative to the other tasks on PATH's plate, Schaller said.

Ultimately, Arndt said he will report back to the Corps that it may be possible for PATH to produce the type of recon-level analysis needed for the report in the available time-frame, but that more definition of the work required. He said he will ask Chuck Willis to dial into PATH's 10 a.m. Tuesday conference call to discuss this task further.

III. PATH Work Priorities.

The group devoted the remainder of the meeting to a discussion of PATH's work priorities through the fall of 1999. Three possible scenarios were considered; ultimately, there was consensus that scenario B1 probably makes the most sense:

ALTERNATIVE B1

March	Fall chinook analysis
April	A-Fish appendix review, fall chinook workshop
May	Produce preliminary fall chinook report
June	Addit'l spr/sum chinook analysis, addit'l fall chinook analysis, EM
July	Addit'l spr/sum chinook analysis, addit'l fall chinook analysis, EM
August	Produce updated FY'98 final report
September	

It was observed that, under this approach, up to six PATH participants will be available to begin laying the groundwork for PATH's development of experimental management alternatives. Jim Geiselman said BPA is unable to support Alternative B1 at this time; Bonneville feels that additional work on the transport "D" values is a much higher priority than

the experimental management work, and BPA is not convinced that PATH is the right group to develop experimental management alternatives.

With that, the meeting was adjourned.